

F48PRIOC

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 RIO TINTO PLC,

4 Plaintiff,

5 v.

14 CV 3042 (RMB) (AJP)

6 VALE, S.A., ET AL.,

7 Defendants.

8 -----x

New York, N.Y.  
April 8, 2015  
2:02 p.m.

9  
10 Before:

11 HON. ANDREW J. PECK,

12 Magistrate Judge

13  
14 APPEARANCES

15 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff

17 BY: MICHAEL J. LYLE

ERIC C. LYTTLE

18 CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

19 Attorneys for Defendant Vale, S.A.

20 BY: LEWIS J. LIMAN

JONATHAN I. BLACKMAN

21 SCOTT B. REENTS

22 MISHCON DE REYA NEW YORK, LLP

23 Attorneys for Defendants BSG Resources Limited and  
Benjamin Steinmetz

24 BY: VINCENT FILARDO, JR.

DAN MANDELL

F48PRIOC

## APPEARANCES (Continued)

LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN J. AUERBACH, ESQ.  
Attorney for Defendant BSG defendants  
BY: MARTIN J. AUERBACH

SULLIVAN & WORCESTER, LLP  
Attorneys for Defendant Mahmoud Thiam  
BY: PAUL E. SUMMIT

ALSO PRESENT: KINNY CHAN, Managing Director, eDiscovery  
Precision Discovery

F48PRIOC

(In open court)

THE COURT: Be seated. Okay. Seems like the first issue you needed me to rule on starts with the Roman numeral IV, discovery from Vale on Page 4 and beyond, correct?

MR. LYLE: Michael Lyle for Rio Tinto. Yes, your Honor, that's our perspective.

THE COURT: And I saw shaking heads in the correct direction. Okay. So let's try to take these in the order of point to put them. The documents from certain custodians, is there anything you want me to do with this at the moment?

MR. LYLE: Yes, your Honor. Michael Lyle for Rio Tinto. Given that we now have learned that we have eight key custodians who have no documents at all because Vale has destroyed those documents, we'd like to get eight replacement custodians.

As your Honor knows, we've requested in our letter already two of the custodians we'd like added. We have two others that we can also identify, but we'd like to get leave to have eight additional custodians that we've designated, plus additional custodians that Vale designates that can tell us who will have documents as close to what has been destroyed by Vale purportedly pursuant to their documents retention policies.

We'd also like, your Honor, to examine what it is exactly that happened in connection with those documents that were destroyed. We've asked in our correspondence that we be

F48PRIOC

1 entitled to receive the document retention policies, as well as  
2 the notices that litigation holds that went out in connection  
3 with their --

4 THE COURT: All right. I thought they've already  
5 agreed to give you some of that, am I misremembering?

6 MR. LYLE: They took it under advisement, your Honor.  
7 We haven't heard a response from them.

8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Liman?

9 MR. LIMAN: Yes, your Honor. I'm prepared to address  
10 this, and if there's a motion, we would be prepared to address  
11 it in writing and seek sanctions from Rio Tinto from this  
12 allegation. It's false. It's spurious. We resent the  
13 accusation of misconduct by me.

14 THE COURT: I'll take note at your outrage. Now,  
15 let's move onto the merits.

16 MR. LIMAN: They talk about eight custodians. All of  
17 those custodians left well over a year before this lawsuit was  
18 filed, before there was ever any reasonable anticipation of  
19 this notice. Their documents were not retained pursuant to the  
20 policies of Vale, which I'm happy to disclose to you and to the  
21 other side. Which is, that when an employee leaves, unless  
22 there is a document holds in place, and there wasn't for these  
23 employees, their hard drive is taken and the hard drive is then  
24 overwritten and no longer exists. E-mails, remain on backup  
25 tapes for one year, and then after a year, those backup tapes

F48PRIOC

1 are overwritten. The fact is --

2 THE COURT: Have you checked to see whether any of the  
3 backup tapes on which these employees' material may have been  
4 stored, may exist because of other reasons that the backup  
5 tapes might have been kept?

6 MR. LIMAN: We did, your Honor, and that ties into the  
7 timing of this. We checked, and we learned from our vendor in  
8 mid-January that there were no documents retained for these  
9 eight individuals.

10 I would add, your Honor, with respect to the request  
11 for additional custodians, I think that should stand on its  
12 own. We have objections with respect to the other two  
13 custodians.

14 THE COURT: I understand the first two that were in  
15 the letter are objected to. I guess I would ask this. Are  
16 there other likely sources of the potentially relevant e-mails  
17 of the eight former employees?

18 MR. LIMAN: Yes. The other custodians, who they  
19 identified and whose e-mails are being searched. So we  
20 believe, and I can give you statistics, that a large number of  
21 the documents with respect to these employees will turn up in  
22 the custodians whose documents are already being searched.

23 I should mention, we're already well advanced, and  
24 further advanced than Rio Tinto, with respect to the predictive  
25 coding and --

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: Subject to a very big issue, which we'll  
2 get to. All right. Are you prepared to give redacted or  
3 indeed unredacted copies of your litigation hold memos,  
4 e-mails, whatever it may be, to the plaintiff's counsel?

5 MR. LIMAN: Not without reviewing them for privilege  
6 and without there being an understanding, mutuality. These  
7 employees did not get the document holds because, again, they  
8 were gone long before there was litigation anticipated.

9 THE COURT: Understood. I will direct the production  
10 of both sides of litigation hold material with whatever  
11 redactions for privilege are appropriate. Hopefully, nobody  
12 will be taking the position that the entire litigation hold  
13 memo itself, regardless of content, is privileged or work  
14 product. I will deal with that, if I have to.

15 As to the replacement custodians, the Court will take  
16 that on a custodian-by-custodian basis on the representation  
17 that Mr. Liman has made that the e-mails of the departed  
18 custodians is likely, or would largely be picked up by existing  
19 custodians who are being searched.

20 What else, Mr. Lyle, on this issue?

21 MR. LYLE: Your Honor, if we could just get  
22 clarification. In the correspondence to your Honor, Vale  
23 indicates in a footnote in their insert --

24 THE COURT: What page?

25 MR. LYLE: On Pages 17 to 18, that they had no

F48PRIOC

1 reasonable anticipation of civil litigation. They did know of  
2 the investigation for the government of Guinea, and we would  
3 request, your Honor, that in addition to the lit hold in  
4 connection with this litigation, that they produce the lit hold  
5 for 2011 identified here.

6 THE COURT: Any lit hold for civil or criminal matters  
7 arising out of the Simandou situation should be produced.

8 MR. LYLE: Thank you.

9 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I assume that that is  
10 reciprocal?

11 THE COURT: Correct.

12 MR. LIMAN: And includes the litigation holds that --  
13 since they anticipate litigation against Guinea back to '09 --

14 THE COURT: What's good for the goose is good for the  
15 gander.

16 Okay. So now the next items are the search terms. Is  
17 this going to be Mr. Liman, Mr. Blackman?

18 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, with respect to the predictive  
19 coding, I think that that is Mr. Reents.

20 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Reents. Mr. Reents, let's  
21 take this in baby steps. Have you produce the keyword lists  
22 that you used to the other side?

23 MR. REENTS: We have, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Yes?

25 MR. REENTS: Yes.

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: All right. Are there additional keywords,  
2 Mr. Lyle, or whoever on your side will be arguing, Mr. Lyttle,  
3 that you would want run? Neither of you have given me the  
4 keywords. Other than perhaps an anecdotal in here, it doesn't  
5 particularly help me.

6 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, if we're going to be going  
7 down the keyword path, yes, absolutely. For example, the very  
8 term that they use to identify the joint venture we don't  
9 believe are included. There are only a handful of Portuguese  
10 terms, which is the language their witnesses speak in. So if  
11 we're going to be using search terms, and we have a threshold  
12 issue with that -- if we're going to be using these search  
13 terms, and we're going to dig into these, we're absolutely  
14 going to have feedback on those search terms.

15 MR. REENTS: Your Honor, if I could just respond  
16 quickly?

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 MR. REENTS: I don't agree with counsel's  
19 characterization of the search terms, but putting that aside,  
20 we're very open to the search term suggestions. We're not  
21 looking for a fight on search terms. This is purely a  
22 pragmatic decision that we had to make in order to give  
23 ourselves a reasonable universe to deal with for  
24 methodological --

25 THE COURT: I guess the question I would ask is in



F48PRIOC

1 some of the other cases, such as Biomet, that use these twin  
2 approach of keywords, followed by predictive coding on balance,  
3 it was because Biomet, they needed to reduce 19-and-a-half  
4 million ESI documents to a more cost-manageable percentage.

5 Starting with a million on a case this big does not  
6 strike me as a break-the-bank proposition. According to the  
7 letter, you did it because of a very low prevalence and you, or  
8 whoever else you've got here with you, explained why the low  
9 prevalence requires this sort of keyword string.

10 MR. REENTS: Right. So I mean, when you get to that  
11 very low prevalence, you need a much larger control set in  
12 order to be able to validate the results of the model.

13 THE COURT: How much larger?

14 MR. REENTS: Significantly larger. So if we, for  
15 example --

16 THE COURT: If it's bigger than a breadbox, can you  
17 put numbers on it?

18 MR. REENTS: Sure. For example, if you want to be  
19 able to estimate recall, plus or minus five percent error with  
20 a 95 percent confidence, and with the control set of about  
21 20,000 or more than 20,000 terms. It's not just a matter of --  
22 as your Honor knows, it's not just a matter of we need to  
23 review those 20,000, but it needs to be an expert reviewer  
24 because this decision is very important that you get it right.

25 In this case, because of the protocol, you have to

F48PRIOC

1 produce the 20,000 to the other side, and it opens up a lot of  
2 potential for ancillary disputes over, you know, how those  
3 documents are coded. So I think it would be opening up a huge  
4 can of worms to try to go down that path.

5 THE COURT: Prior to even running the keywords, did  
6 you do the deduping, delisting, getting rid of, you know,  
7 @ESPN.com and all the things to weed out the junk?

8 MR. REENTS: Yes, we did the deduping. It's a global  
9 dedupe and did the delisting. We haven't, at this point, done  
10 a culling out of the bulk terms, but at least in a systematic  
11 way. But our experience has been that that usually takes out  
12 five percent or so. It's not going to make a material  
13 difference.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Lyttle?

15 MR. LYTTLE: You Honor, I think we need to take a step  
16 back. This document universe is fundamentally flawed already.  
17 It's missing eight of the key custodians and the low prevalence  
18 that we're seeing --

19 THE COURT: It may or may not, but the universe is the  
20 universe. You may or may not, down the road, when you've  
21 completed discovery, be able to show that they should have  
22 preserved and whether under the current version of 37, or the  
23 presumptively effective December 1, 2015, version of 37(e),  
24 that they did, with intent to deprive, and all of that jazz.

25 But keywords doesn't effect that. So I would like to

F48PRIOC

1 get this conference over in less than our traditional hour or  
2 two hour or whatever. Let's focus on the issue, which is the  
3 keyword screening or other methods of using predictive coding  
4 in a cost effective manner.

5 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, if I may. If we're stuck  
6 with this document universe, we've told Vale that we're willing  
7 to work with these keyword search terms, but the problem here,  
8 your Honor, is they've known since mid-January they were going  
9 to have eight custodians. Mr. Liman just admitted that.

10 THE COURT: Counsel, counsel, counsel. I'm going to  
11 start enforcing a rule of brevity and that when you go off  
12 topic, you're done. So are you done on this issue, or would  
13 you like to stay on the topic? You are not my only case. I am  
14 seeing you regularly with 20-page, single-spaced letters of  
15 disputes that either want a ruling or not. I'm fed up with  
16 lawyers who don't take instruction. You're the one getting hit  
17 with it at the moment.

18 MR. LYTTLE: Understood, your Honor. We'll, work them  
19 on the keyword search terms. If I may, reserve the right to  
20 contend that this document universe is not appropriate and that  
21 later --

22 THE COURT: You always have the right, you know,  
23 Sedona Principle 6 and 7.

24 MR. LYTTLE: Thank you, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: The producing party is in the best

F48PRIOC

1 position, in general, to decide the method to be used.

2 Principle Seven, the burden is on the other side, but it's not  
3 a irrebuttable, or it's not something that once they've decided  
4 as the producing party, that's the end of the universe.

5 You all have entered into a protocol that, in  
6 retrospect, you might have wanted to make better than it is.  
7 You're all somewhat stuck with what you've agreed to, and that  
8 included some keyword searching to narrow down the universe.  
9 The fact that it's much greater than you anticipated, you know,  
10 so be it.

11 All right. Next. The due diligence material, is  
12 there any reason, at this point, that it needs to be done  
13 immediately, based on the response?

14 The other thing, before you answer that and before I  
15 forget, I am directing the defendants to file what I'll call a  
16 protective-and-without-prejudice answer to the complaint so we  
17 will know what affirmative defenses, if any, are being raised.  
18 Otherwise, there is the danger that we will finish ESI  
19 discovery, if not all discovery, before Judge Berman is able to  
20 rule on the motion, and then you will suddenly throw in some  
21 affirmative defense that changes the scope of discovery.

22 So I guess my questions are, one, any problem with  
23 that? And, two, how soon can you do it? Mr. Liman?

24 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, we would like 30 days to do  
25 it. We hadn't begun work on the answer in this case.

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: That doesn't --

2 MR. LIMAN: And that's what the rules would give us.

3 THE COURT: No, I think the rules would give you  
4 either ten or 21 days from the Court's decision. Be that as it  
5 may, two weeks.

6 MR. SUMMIT: Can we get 21 days?

7 MR. LIMAN: Can we get -- There are various of us that  
8 have travel schedules --

9 THE COURT: Okay. April 29th will give you 21 days.

10 MR. FILARDO: As you know, BSGR and Mr. Steinmetz  
11 have --

12 THE COURT: That's why I said it's without prejudice  
13 to your rights.

14 MR. FILARDO: Okay. We'll have that as one of our  
15 affirmative defenses, as well.

16 THE COURT: Understood.

17 MR. FILARDO: That's just a concern because the answer  
18 is typically --

19 THE COURT: I understand. You know, you can put a  
20 footnote after the word "answer" that says, you know, you  
21 reserve all rights, you were ordered to do this, it's without  
22 prejudice, you know, blah, blah, blah, et cetera.

23 MR. FILARDO: Thank you, your Honor.

24 MR. LIMAN: And we can -- I assume we can also amend  
25 based on the decision, as we need to amend?

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: Correct. Okay. So with that, I guess the  
2 question is, particularly after the sentence that the requested  
3 material are largely privileged or non-existent, other than,  
4 you know, they got your investigation material early,  
5 particularly since you already have your subpoena out, why is  
6 this crucial?

7 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I think for the same reasons  
8 they argued. We have a subpoena out to one investigative firm.  
9 There are other due diligence parties that were involved here,  
10 many of which are going to require foreign discovery either  
11 through letters rogatory or the Hague and we'd just like to get  
12 started on that.

13 THE COURT: So get started on your Hague requests.

14 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, without seeing the report,  
15 it's very hard, under Hague, to say please give us all of your  
16 due diligence. We'd like to see reports and --

17 THE COURT: Who are you talking about? Cleary  
18 Gottlieb and Clifford Chance are pretty local.

19 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I don't have their  
20 interrogatory responses in front of me, but there's a number of  
21 other --

22 THE COURT: Your letter refers to Nardello and then  
23 drops a footnote saying you served a subpoena on Nardello,  
24 Cleary Gottlieb and Clifford Chance, "among others."

25 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I don't have the memo at my

F48PRIOC

1 fingertips. There are a number of other firms. We've actually  
2 asked Vale to help clarify their role in this. Again, trying  
3 to tailor any third-party discovery, we have not served a  
4 subpoena on Cleary Gottlieb because we didn't think your Honor  
5 would want that.

6 THE COURT: Correct. And they told you they didn't  
7 represent Vale in this.

8 MR. LYTTLE: They didn't represent Vale in 2010.  
9 There was a full re-evaluation at Vale of that due diligence.  
10 Were they involved then? We don't know that. And defendant's  
11 statements --

12 THE COURT: Here is the Court's ruling. Try  
13 cooperating with each other. Give a little informal discovery  
14 on what was done, et cetera, and then treat the reports in the  
15 normal course of your discovery. But, on the other hand, if  
16 they're sitting in your office, Mr. Liman, Mr. Blackman,  
17 whatever, you know, in a nice, neat little file, et cetera,  
18 don't play games.

19 MR. BLACKMAN: Your Honor, if I could just briefly  
20 speak to that. That's, obviously, a sensible direction. This  
21 whole issue seems to be a part around a magazine article that  
22 they cite at length in their letter. That article was issued,  
23 was written, was published in March 2014, before they brought  
24 this lawsuit, and they knew about it because, in fact, they  
25 mentioned it to us last fall during a meet and confer.

F48PRIOC

1           So this is not new news, and I just would say for the  
2       record that that article, in many respects, is completely  
3       wrong. I will represent to the Court that Cleary Gottlieb had  
4       nothing whatever to do with due diligence for Vale at the time  
5       of the joint venture, and that this re-due diligence that  
6       they're talking about is, as far as we know, completely  
7       fiction.

8           THE COURT: All right.

9           MR. BLACKMAN: Most of this stuff is privileged but --

10          THE COURT: This is the sort of discussion that if the  
11       two of you had before you got to court, you might have saved  
12       several single-spaced pages of letters on both sides of the  
13       letter issue. Discuss it. If you have to come back to me on  
14       it, you'll come back to me.

15          MR. LYTTLE: Thank you, your Honor.

16          THE COURT: Next, the predictive coding disclosure  
17       dates. Vale has already given you its control set disclosure.  
18       Why do we need seed set disclosure dates and all these other  
19       things, some of which, at least as of today, is going to be in  
20       serious flux because of the need to run additional keywords and  
21       work the results into the document review? I suspect,  
22       therefore, this is something you all should work out a little  
23       further down the road.

24          MR. LYTTLE: That was our goal, your Honor. We kicked  
25       some dates out to them. We said, hey, what do you think? We'd



F48PRIOC

1 like to put some dates around this, try to work towards the  
2 June 30th deadline for substantial completion. That was  
3 rejected outright. They then dropped their control set, with  
4 no notice on us, while we were reviewing ours.

5 I think the control set should be reviewed because  
6 we're going to have to rerun more search terms. We just would  
7 like, your Honor -- Vale to date has produced about 2,500  
8 documents and we've produced about 60,000, and we just want to  
9 try and get some dates on the calendar that everybody is  
10 working towards and that the Court has ordered.

11 THE COURT: My concern is that the dates may be  
12 counterproductive, considering what you are all doing,  
13 particularly -- and I will say that the control set disclosure  
14 by Vale will not be triggering objections at this stage because  
15 of the need to refine the control set potentially after  
16 additional documents are developed using whatever additional  
17 keywords the plaintiff suggests that are reasonable.  
18 Obviously, a suggestion of a keyword that adds over a million  
19 documents back into the set is not going to be well received by  
20 Vale or the Court. So no dates at this point, but try to work  
21 together.

22 Okay. Specific document requests. Although I think I  
23 may have missed the issue of the two additional witnesses  
24 because of where it was stuck --

25 MR. REENTS: Your Honor?

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2 MR. REENTS: Before we move on, could we just ask that  
3 you give us a date by which Rio Tinto would make its search  
4 terms, in order to keep this process moving?

5 THE COURT: Mr. Lyttle?

6 MR. LYTTLE: I think we could have search terms early  
7 next week, Monday or Tuesday.

8 THE COURT: Tuesday.

9 MR. REENTS: Okay.

10 THE COURT: Where in this letter are the additional  
11 witnesses or the additional custodians? Vale's response is on  
12 Page 11. I seem to have lost where your request is.

13 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, it's the bottom of Page 7,  
14 continuing on to the top of Page 8.

15 THE COURT: Thank you. Well, they say these people  
16 came onboard after the fact. Why is their material relevant?  
17 You know, if all you're going to do is have them gather  
18 material and then because most of your disputes, I think, are  
19 scope issues, not technology issues, they're going to find  
20 nothing in those documents because of the date. What's the  
21 point?

22 MR. LYLE: Your Honor, the documents that we expect  
23 that we would find relate to the look-back diligence that was  
24 done, again, in 2011 that --

25 THE COURT: Of which they said there wasn't any.

F48PRIOC

1 MR. LYLE: And so if that is accurate and there are no  
2 documents, then they can make that representation to us, we're  
3 not going to have any documents about any of the 2011 due  
4 diligence.

5 But setting that aside, your Honor, they've asserted  
6 that, in defense to our allegations, that they looked back and  
7 that they found absolutely nothing. Mr. Blackman has told this  
8 Court and Judge Berman, we've scoured all of our documents and  
9 we've seen nothing, they indicate, that any of the allegations  
10 that we have, including our allegation that there was a;  
11 concealment of the conspiracy all the way up through 2013.

12 These individuals were present in Vale. They were  
13 senior people who both have information, or should have  
14 information, about their dealings with BSGR and the other  
15 members of the conspiracy. Again, if they come forward with  
16 evidence to show, and they make a search and they find nothing,  
17 then that's what they can tell us.

18 THE COURT: If they make a search, that's going to  
19 change the whole dynamics of the predictive coding process.  
20 So, Mr. Blackman, what do you need to do to verify that the  
21 article that talked about a look-back in 2011, there was no  
22 such look-back?

23 MR. BLACKMAN: We don't believe there was, and we're  
24 happy to talk to them and, hopefully, give them the proof.  
25 That's proving a negative, but we can certainly do that.

F48PRIOC

1 I just would like to say to the Court that besides  
2 these people having not been employed at the relevant time,  
3 they are so unrelated to this, that they are not even listed in  
4 Rio Tinto's interrogatory answers, where they list tens of Vale  
5 employees as having knowledge. They don't list these people.

6 THE COURT: Are they listed in your 26(a) --

7 MR. BLACKMAN: No, because, again, this is like apex  
8 discovery. The current CEO --

9 THE COURT: I understand.

10 MR. BLACKMAN: Well, the current CEO doesn't know  
11 anything about what happened before --

12 THE COURT: That there is a difference between apex  
13 deposition discovery and document review. Do what you need to  
14 do without, obviously, pulling every form of ESI and running it  
15 through the system to verify with Mr. Ferrara and Mr. Flores  
16 that they had nothing to do with anything related to this case.  
17 Make that representation in writing to the plaintiffs, and if  
18 that's the situation, we're done.

19 If you can't make that representation, then you and  
20 they should talk about what should be done, if anything, to  
21 review documents.

22 MR. BLACKMAN: That's fine. Just to be clear, this  
23 case means the alleged conspiracy with BSGR, the negotiation of  
24 the JAB, the prior abortive discussions with Rio Tinto,  
25 et cetera, not, obviously, the defense of this lawsuit, which

F48PRIOC

1 of course they know about.

2 THE COURT: Obviously. Okay. Come on. You all know  
3 what the scope of the case is. I'm not --

4 MR. LYLE: But --

5 THE COURT: No, no. We're moving on.

6 MR. LYLE: Your Honor, if I may just be heard. They  
7 consistently try to narrow what they think the scope of the  
8 case is. That's what their defense is. Okay? We dispute that  
9 vigorously. The case involves a longer time period than they  
10 want to say. They want to try to use those dates to cabin us  
11 in on the discovery. That's wrong.

12 The allegations are and the proof is, we have arrests  
13 that were made in 2013. The conspiracy and the acts associated  
14 with it took place over a much longer period of time than what  
15 Vale wants to accept. That's the what the fact is. Our  
16 complaint makes those allegations crystal clear.

17 So we're entitled to test his arguments, the arguments  
18 that he's making and see if, in fact, there's any evidence that  
19 shows that Vale knew what was happening with BSGR. The article  
20 indicates --

21 THE COURT: That I understand is what they are  
22 searching for, correct?

23 MR. BLACKMAN: That's correct, and if he's --

24 THE COURT: Stop. Stop with "that's correct."

25 MR. BLACKMAN: That's correct.

F48PRIOC

1           THE COURT: We're moving on. The various requests at  
2           issue. Starting with request 53, the Guinean election of 2010  
3           in its broadest sense?

4           MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, the Guinean election of 2010  
5           brought in a new administration in Guinea that did just what  
6           these defendants were afraid of. They initiated review of the  
7           mining contract. They found fraud. They found bribery, and  
8           they ripped it up.

9           Your Honor, what we'd like to know is what was this  
10          conspiracy talking about when they were worried about the  
11          election of 2010 and Mr. Thiam, who was the Guinean minister at  
12          the time, losing his administration and his ability to further  
13          the conspiracy inside Guinea.

14          THE COURT: Is Thiam one of the concepts being  
15          searched for, whether using the keywords and/or predictive  
16          coding?

17          MR. BLACKMAN: Absolutely, yes, your Honor.

18          THE COURT: Okay. Stop. Thank you. Learn to answer.  
19          You don't even need absolutes. The word "yes" or "no" will  
20          often suffice.

21          Okay. Other than what comes up by Thiam, this is much  
22          too broad; so I'm not rewriting the requests.

23          56 and 63, what's the relevance of the alleged  
24          meeting?

25          MR. LYTTLE: I think it's exactly, your Honor, what

F48PRIOC

1 we've been talking about. This is part of when the Conde  
2 administration came to power in 2011 and started investigating  
3 what happened at Simandou. We would like to know what exactly  
4 Vale was doing to understand what that investigation meant with  
5 further deals with BSGR. Does it show that they knew when they  
6 entered the deal in 2010 that BSGR paid bribes to receive the  
7 rights to box one and two? That's what we're trying to get at,  
8 the exact same thing. This is a second round of due diligence  
9 with a new --

10 THE COURT: All right. Is there a way, considering  
11 the way you're all doing these searches, to limit it to the  
12 information about the bribery, the conspiracy, the potential  
13 loss of rights because of a new administration, as opposed to  
14 just the general operations of Simandou and how that might have  
15 been affected by a meeting with the president?

16 MR. BLACKMAN: Yes. And our problem with this, again,  
17 is that we've already agreed to produce, and the searches will  
18 pick up, anything having to do with the allegations of bribery,  
19 corruption, et cetera, as well as the misappropriation, which  
20 we haven't heard about yet today.

21 But, again, this request is overbroad because when the  
22 president of Brazil and the president of Guinea and the  
23 president of Vale get together at a meeting, they're going to  
24 be discussing other things, including things of competitive  
25 interests to --

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: Let me ask you a question.

2 MR. BLACKMAN: -- our competitor.

3 THE COURT: This seems like the sort of request where  
4 you may be right, and if we weren't doing predictive coding,  
5 you know, this is the sort of thing where you would look and  
6 see if there is a file or a re line saying "meeting with Conde,  
7 meeting with da Silva," whatever.

8 Obviously, I've said this before, and the plaintiffs  
9 seemed to help with quoting it back, if you're just searching  
10 for the word "bribe" or "bribery" or any of its variants,  
11 "conspiracy," you know, "bad acts," et cetera, et cetera,  
12 you're never going to find anything. So the question is, is  
13 there a way, without changing the whole search protocol, to  
14 come up with whatever information there may have been about  
15 these alleged -- it's a very narrow topic, a meeting, and then  
16 once you find whatever there is about the meeting, you can  
17 determine, and, if necessary, a special master can determine,  
18 whether it was normal business or funny business, for lack of a  
19 better term.

20 MR. BLACKMAN: I think, in theory, one could add to  
21 the search terms references to these meetings, and I think  
22 that, subject to being told that that would be a vast  
23 additional expense, we have no conceptual problem with that.  
24 We do have a problem with then producing any document having to  
25 do with the meeting.



F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: Search it, and then one can determine  
2 whether anything exists so this is not a law school  
3 hypothetical and it's something real, and then you can have  
4 discussions with plaintiff's counsel, yes, we found four  
5 documents but they deal with normal business, et cetera, and if  
6 necessary, a special master will make that determination.

7 MR. BLACKMAN: Okay.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, may I be briefly heard?

10 THE COURT: Sure. You can snatch defeat from the jaws  
11 of victory.

12 MR. LYTTLE: That's not my intent. My concern is we  
13 don't know if we have the right custodians anymore and --

14 THE COURT: What would you like me to do about that,  
15 counsel? Invent the eight people's files?

16 MR. LYTTLE: May I, your Honor?

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 MR. LYTTLE: I think there is a solution here. They  
19 have a duty, just like we did, to go ask their client who are  
20 the right custodians. They have not told us they've done that,  
21 and they need to do that and propose additional custodians that  
22 would have documents or may have documents responsive to these  
23 requests.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Liman, very briefly, you've talked to  
25 your clients?

F48PRIOC

1 MR. LIMAN: We take seriously our obligations with  
2 respect to the interrogatories. We have answered the  
3 interrogatory questions accurately. We take seriously our  
4 obligations under Rule 26, including our obligations to update,  
5 if there's a need to do it, and we will do it. We don't  
6 believe there's any need, and we've talked to the client.  
7 We've done our investigation.

8 THE COURT: Let's put it this way. Now that you know  
9 that eight custodians who were on the list of people whose  
10 documents were going to be gathered don't have any, have you  
11 verified with your client whether there is anybody else whose  
12 documents -- and by that I always mean ESI as well -- should be  
13 searched?

14 MR. LIMAN: If we haven't, your Honor, we will. We  
15 have looked at our interrogatories.

16 THE COURT: All right. So you will send the letter to  
17 Mr. Lyttle confirming whether there is anyone else whose  
18 documents should be searched?

19 MR. LIMAN: Correct.

20 THE COURT: And you will do that within a week.

21 Next, what is it about the departure requests, 57, of  
22 these people?

23 MR. LYTTLE: I'm sorry, your Honor, I don't see --

24 THE COURT: Okay. You're right. Somehow that was on  
25 Page 14. I thought it was following that; so if that's not --

F48PRIOC

1 MR. LYTTLE: The good news, your Honor, I think that's  
2 one of the effects of sealing that we agreed not to push.

3 THE COURT: Okay. 62.

4 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, it's the same. I don't think  
5 we need to belabor the Court's time. It's the same issue  
6 there.

7 THE COURT: What's the next one that you want to  
8 belabor my time on?

9 MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, I believe they all relate to  
10 that second round of analyzing the BSGR deal that we believe  
11 we're entitled to, as before.

12 THE COURT: When did this so-called second round  
13 occur?

14 MR. LYTTLE: 2011 is our understanding, based on the  
15 article, as well as the investigative reports that they now  
16 have and have seen.

17 THE COURT: Take a look at the last bullet point at  
18 the top of Page 16. That's a little more narrow.

19 Look, is there any issue? Mr. Blackman, are you  
20 searching in the 2011 period of the so-called look-back, or  
21 whatever the newspaper article called it, for any material that  
22 would in any way relate to Vale's discovery or development or  
23 whatever at that point of any information about what may have  
24 gone on previously with respect to bribery, conspiracy,  
25 et cetera, et cetera, without limiting it to the bad buzz

F48PRIOC

1 words?

2 MR. BLACKMAN: Yes.

3 THE COURT: Good. That takes care of that.

4 Okay. I think we are now over to the discovery that  
5 Vale wants from the plaintiff. On privilege logs, I'll give  
6 you your choice. You can all work this out, and it sounds like  
7 on some of this you're the outside ER person and whether  
8 they're the equivalent of an inside you're still discussing it.  
9 Has that been resolved?

10 MR. LYTTLE: Correct, that is with defendants BSGR and  
11 Steinmetz.

12 THE COURT: Yes?

13 MR. FILARDO: Yes.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Has that been resolved?

15 MR. FILARDO: It has not been resolved. We are  
16 discussing it with our information.

17 THE COURT: Nobody wants me to rule at this point,  
18 right?

19 MR. LYTTLE: That is correct, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Inadvertently produced privileged  
21 documents. I'm now at Page 20. If I've missed anything before  
22 then, somebody tell me. 502(d) means they need to be returned,  
23 or if you desperately need them for another potential motion  
24 that they are otherwise not privileged, they need to be sealed  
25 up and cabined off, whatever the right term is. I won't

F48PRIOC

1 require that you give it back, per say, but it really can't be  
2 used for anything other than a potential motion in front of me.  
3 Is everyone clear on that?

4 MR. BLACKMAN: Yes, your Honor.

5 MR. LYTTLE: Yes, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Are we done?

7 MR. BLACKMAN: We have the issue which seems to be,  
8 unfortunately, a recurring one about having Rio Tinto amend its  
9 interrogatory answers to give us just the names of the  
10 unidentified sources in the investigative reports because we  
11 had a big discussion about this, and it's a little hard to know  
12 what they were fighting so hard about because, in many cases  
13 when we did get the unredacted reports, it referred generically  
14 to five or six officials at Guinea, BSGR executives --

15 THE COURT: Stop, stop. Does Rio Tinto have the  
16 underlying information.

17 MR. LYTTLE: We do not, your Honor, and there's no  
18 reason we would.

19 MR. BLACKMAN: Your Honor, they have represented to  
20 the Court that Rio Tinto, not its counsel, Rio Tinto hired  
21 these firms. They haven't given us -- we asked them -- the  
22 engagement letters, but it seems to us that, as the people who  
23 hired them, they may well be entitled to ask to get this  
24 information. And we have seen no showing from them that they  
25 are not in a position to do that.

F48PRIOC

MR. LYTTLE: Your Honor, may I approach?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LIMAN: Do you have one for us?

MR. LYTTLE: There is.

Your Honor, despite Vale prematurely pulling the ripcord on the investigator materials we gave following the Hague, we happened to discuss with the investigators, we have requested from all of them the material Vale requested. They uniformly have rejected that request. We are continuing to discuss with them, including gathering the political contracts, and when they're found, we will provide them. But this is a first example of the positions that they're taking. This is a letter from --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LYTTLE: -- Begbies Traynor, which is one of the investigative firms known as BTG. We have advised the Court that they might be coming. They are coming down. We have made every effort that we can to get this information. We are not entitled to it. They will not provide it, and Vale has decided to go to the Hague, and that's where they need to go.

THE COURT: Why don't you produce the umbrella supplier contract that was, obviously, an attachment to this letter and, therefore, one can assume it's very readily available.

MR. LYTTLE: It actually does say that. It wasn't

F48PRIOC

1 attached. This came in right before the hearing. We're going  
2 to write --

3 THE COURT: So to the extent you get letters like  
4 this, give them to defense counsel. If you provide copies of  
5 the contracts with these folks that will presumably support  
6 your position or, in any event, even if it doesn't support your  
7 position, if the supplier is refusing to turn it over, and  
8 assuming there's no winking going on and I certainly assume  
9 that and believe that, you'll have to pursue it through the  
10 Hague.

11 MR. BLACKMAN: That's fine. If we could just, for the  
12 agreements, the umbrella agreement and the comparable  
13 agreements with the other investigators --

14 THE COURT: If they are readily at hand, they will be  
15 produced.

16 MR. BLACKMAN: In a week or so?

17 THE COURT: Probably simultaneously with your  
18 producing whatever those reports were that they wanted  
19 urgently, immediately, that I told you to produce if they are  
20 at hand; so quid pro quo, goose and gander, all that good  
21 stuff. So that's the end of that.

22 So, yes, basically a week, but presumably you're  
23 complying as well.

24 MR. BLACKMAN: Right.

25 MR. LYTTLE: Thank you, your Honor. May I approach

F48PRIOC

1 with one more documents?

2 THE COURT: Yes. Is this another letter?

3 MR. LYTTLE: No. It's a news article that appeared  
4 this morning, and I think it's probably a little bit of what we  
5 were afraid of with the investigators. We're not sure how this  
6 got to the media, but with names made public, just as we  
7 feared, others are out there indicating these investigators and  
8 their sources are going to be called to this courtroom to  
9 testify, which we've repeatedly said we don't anticipate  
10 happening. We're --

11 THE COURT: First of all --

12 MR. BLACKMAN: Your Honor, this is --

13 THE COURT: First of all, you know, I'm not exactly  
14 sure what this means, but that British private investigators  
15 will be called to testify before the Southern District in  
16 New York. You know, the journalist thinks my power goes a lot  
17 further than the Constitution and the Hague Convention do.

18 MR. LYTTLE: Understood, your Honor. There's not  
19 anything I'm asking you to do. We're just bringing this to the  
20 Court's attention that this is the exact -- you may know that,  
21 and we as lawyers may know that, but these investigators --

22 THE COURT: They suspect --

23 MR. LYTTLE: -- with their source networks don't know  
24 that.

25 THE COURT: I'm sorry, who doesn't know it?



F48PRIOC

1 MR. LYTTLE: The investigators.

2 THE COURT: Oh, come on. Seriously? Seriously? You  
3 know, unless they just started their company yesterday, and  
4 clearly they didn't, I would be very surprised if investigators  
5 don't know that they may be in the witness stand. I am  
6 assuming, Mr. Blackman and all other counsel, that this did not  
7 come from your clients. Is that correct?

8 MR. BLACKMAN: It certainly did not, and the article,  
9 and I have no idea whether there's any truth to this says, at  
10 the request of businessman Benny Steinmetz's company --

11 THE COURT: That's not --

12 MR. BLACKMAN: So I don't know. This is certainly not  
13 coming from us.

14 THE COURT: All right. Everybody willing to agree, on  
15 behalf of their clients, to a gag order? Anybody have a  
16 problem with that?

17 MR. BLACKMAN: No, your Honor.

18 MR. FILARDO: No, your Honor.

19 MR. AUERBACH: No, your Honor.

20 MR. SUMMIT: No, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Lyttle?

22 MR. LYTTLE: I will speak with my client, your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Well, that's interesting. There is no gag  
24 order until you all stipulate to one. So the defendants are  
25 willing, if they don't change their mind, but it's, you know,

F48PRIOC

1 interesting that you're upset about there being press articles  
2 about certain things that are essentially public, maybe below  
3 the radar but, you know, there are Hague Convention requests,  
4 they're signed in on the docket here.

5 This sounds more like somebody got it from the docket  
6 in the UK, if there is indeed such a docket, or that it got it  
7 from somebody. To the extent you don't want to tie your  
8 client's hands, that's fine, but don't complain to me, absent  
9 party agreement and subject to the codes of ethics that apply  
10 to lawyers but not their clients, that they can do what they  
11 want except, obviously, anything that's under a confidentiality  
12 awe agreement. That overrides everything else.

13 MR. LYTTLE: Understood, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Anything else for today, other than our  
15 next conference date?

16 MR. LYTTLE: One small point I think we skipped in the  
17 letter, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. LYTTLE: There's a footnote.

20 THE COURT: Page?

21 MR. LYTTLE: I'm looking, your Honor. I'm sorry.  
22 It's a lengthy letter.

23 THE COURT: Really? I hadn't noticed.

24 MR. LYTTLE: Footnote 4 on Page 16. We had, as this  
25 Court is aware, there's a parallel arbitration going on between

F48PRIOC

1 Vale and BSGR in London. We, as part of our document requests,  
2 have asked for materials produced in the arbitration, as well  
3 as the pleadings and filings in that.

4 I understand Vale has agreed to that, which we  
5 appreciate, but we, for the first time in this footnote,  
6 learned that BSGR has not agreed to that and will not agree to  
7 that. I tried to speak with Mr. Filardo before the hearing.  
8 We didn't have a chance to finish, but I'm just not sure what  
9 basis there is to refuse that.

10 MR. FILARDO: Your Honor, I'm just getting my arms  
11 around this issue as well, but I understand that request No. 66  
12 issued by Rio Tinto to Vale, which categorically requests the  
13 production of all documents in the LCIA arbitration, including  
14 documents that my clients had produced and documents such as  
15 witness statements and statements of the case, they're seeking  
16 that categorically from Vale.

17 I understand Vale is not objecting and has, instead,  
18 requested permission from the LCIA panel for the arbitration to  
19 have an exception -- this is my understanding -- an exception  
20 to the confidentiality provisions of that arbitration. My  
21 client has objected to that, and is opposing that before the  
22 LCIA panel.

23 I don't know where that issue is at right now. I do  
24 not know if it's fully briefed. I do not believe there's been  
25 a decision. I think -- I was going to raise it as well to the

F48PRIOC

1 Court today as I'm learning about this, that we do not think  
2 it's appropriate that Vale not object, at least in part, to  
3 that request with respect to producing --

4 THE COURT: Since they're not producing it, the issue  
5 really is what's the tribunal going to do. At this point, and  
6 with the instructions to counsel to tell their counterpart that  
7 the Court would appreciate a prompt ruling from those  
8 arbitrators so that I don't have to rule on it independently.  
9 You know, this may be a situation where the federal rules trump  
10 the LCIA provisions. I would rather not get into that sort of  
11 fight.

12 So tell the LCIA, whoever has that contact -- I guess  
13 it's both Vale and BSGR's appropriate arbitration counsel --  
14 that this court needs a prompt ruling. In the absence of a  
15 prompt ruling, this Court will rule on the issue as a matter of  
16 U.S. discovery. Let me put it this way. While we are going  
17 slowly with respect to BSGR and going through the Hague  
18 Convention, et cetera, this technically is a request to Vale,  
19 and the Court may well exercise its authority, not necessarily  
20 on a blanket basis but on a relevant-to-this-litigation basis,  
21 that if they have information from BSGR because of the  
22 arbitration relevant to this litigation, you know, I'm not sure  
23 that I can't override the tribunal.

24 But that's a gut reaction to a footnote that I'm not  
25 even sure I read before this very second. Even though I read

F48PRIOC

1 most of the letter and its other footnotes, that one slipped by  
2 me. Let's try to get a ruling out of the arbitrators promptly  
3 and possibly something that the three relevant sides can work  
4 on here in terms of a compromise.

5 MR. BLACKMAN: Your Honor, the matter will be fully  
6 briefed before the arbitral tribunal a week from this coming  
7 Friday. And we have told them that, ultimately, we don't want  
8 to have a dispute needlessly between that tribunal and this  
9 court, but that, ultimately, will be a matter for this court to  
10 determine. So they're apprised of that.

11 THE COURT: All right. I'm sure you'll be bringing  
12 this back to me at the next conference, if it hasn't resolved  
13 either by the tribunal or by BSGR agreeing with Vale and Rio  
14 Tinto to the release, under the Court's protective order here,  
15 confidentiality order, to certain, that is, the  
16 relevant-to-this-lawsuit information that may have been  
17 developed in the arbitration proceeding.

18 MR. BLACKMAN: We would welcome that.

19 THE COURT: All right. That really means,  
20 Mr. Filardo, it's in your client's control more than anybody  
21 else.

22 MR. FILARDO: Yes, your Honor. We're happy to  
23 consider that and discuss that. We just have not had the  
24 opportunity.

25 THE COURT: All right. When do you all want to come

F48PRIOC

1 back?

2 MR. BLACKMAN: In roughly four weeks, your Honor?

3 THE COURT: Okay. How about either May 7th in the  
4 afternoon or May 8th? What's your pleasure?

5 MR. LIMAN: Your Honor, I have a CLE in the courthouse  
6 on May 7th.

7 THE COURT: Does that mean you'd like to be here  
8 because you'll be here at 5:00 anyway, or you'd rather not?

9 MR. LIMAN: I would rather not, unless --

10 THE COURT: Okay. May 8th at 2:00, that's a Friday.  
11 Does that work for everybody?

12 MR. LYLE: Your Honor, if I could just have it for the  
13 Monday?

14 THE COURT: I can't give you anything on Monday,  
15 May 11th, other than 9:30 for half an hour. I'm on criminal DE  
16 that week. So you can do it any of the 7th, the 8th. We can  
17 do it on the 6th, but it would have to be in the morning and I  
18 know you guys, on the plaintiff side, like to come up the day  
19 of. I've got the week of the 4th afternoons, on the Monday the  
20 4th or the 7th or the 8th, mornings on some of the other days.

21 MR. LYLE: I'll find a way to make the 8th work, your  
22 Honor. I think that's best for everything.

23 THE COURT: Okay. May 8th at 2:00. Usual drill,  
24 you're all required to purchase the transcript.

25 MR. LYLE: Thank you, your Honor.

F48PRIOC

1 THE COURT: With that, we are adjourned.

2 MR. LIMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

3 (Adjourned)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25